

**REMARKS**

The above-referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action, dated January 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005, in which: claims 1-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being obvious over Chmaytelli (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,096, hereinafter "*Chmaytelli*") in view of Nakamura (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,464, hereinafter "*Nakamura*"). Reconsideration of the above-referenced patent application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-69 are pending in the above-referenced patent application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-69 under 35 U.S.C 103(a). This rejection by the Examiner is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that neither *Chmaytelli* nor *Nakamura*, when viewed alone or in combination, contain all of the elements of the rejected claims. However, Applicant does not by this argument accept that the combination is proper; rather, while Applicant asserts that the combination is improper, Applicant further asserts that even if the combination were proper, the combination would still fail to provide all the elements of the rejected claims.

The Examiner, in the Office Action, page 2, states "*Chmaytelli* does not disclose providing a second mode of operation in which the communication functionality is disabled and the local functionality is enabled." The Examiner submits that *Nakamura* provides this limitation. However, *Nakamura* does not cure the deficiency noted by the Examiner in *Chmaytelli*. For example, neither of the cited patents disclose a method for selectively disabling the wireless communication functionality of an integrated portable computing-communication device, the method comprising providing a first mode of operation in which both wireless communication functionality and local functionality of the device are enabled, providing a second mode of operation in which the communication functionality is disabled and the local functionality is enabled, and selectively switching between the first and second modes of operation. There is no contemplation throughout the *Chmaytelli* patent to provide a second mode of operation in which the communication functionality is disabled and the local functionality is enabled. Additionally, *Nakamura* teaches away from the rejected claim. For example, there is no contemplation

of enabling local functionality in the "mobile units" of Nakamura, and the "mobile units" referred to do not have first and second modes of operation including wireless and local functionality, respectively. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under section 103 of the patent statute has not been made, and it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 10-16 depend from and include all limitations of claim 9, and therefore distinguish from the cited art at least on the same basis. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of these claims.

Claims 1-8 distinguish from the cited art for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 9. For example, neither *Chmaytelli* nor *Nakamura* describe an integrated mobile device that provides local functionality and communication functionality, comprising a power supply, a computing unit coupled to the power supply, a radio communication unit, and a switch coupled to the power supply and the computing unit, to selectively couple the radio communication unit to the power supply, to provide first and second modes of operation, wherein the first mode of operation enables the computing unit and the radio communication unit, and the second mode of operation disables the radio communication unit and enables the computing unit. Because claims 1-8 distinguish for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 9, it is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of these claims.

Claims 23-36 distinguish from the cited art for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 9. For example, neither *Chmaytelli* nor *Nakamura* describe enabling access to user-operated computing functionality and access to making and receiving wireless calls, subsequently disabling the access to making and receiving wireless calls, while simultaneously maintaining the access to the user-operated computing functionality while the access to making and receiving wireless calls is disabled. Because claims 23-36 distinguish for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 9, it is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of these claims.

Claims 57-64 distinguish from the cited art for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 9. For example, neither *Chmaytelli* nor *Nakamura* describe a method comprising

simultaneously enabling access to the interactive data processing functionality and enabling operation of a mechanism for wireless signal communication, and in response to detecting an event, disabling the operation of the mechanism for wireless signal communication while simultaneously maintaining the access to the interactive data processing functionality. Because claims 57-64 distinguish for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 9, it is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of these claims.

Claims 17-22, claims 37-56, and claims 65-69 distinguish from the cited art at least for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claims 1-16, 23-36 and 57-64, above. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of these claims.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 640-6475. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account number 50-3130.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

5/6/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael J. Willardson  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 50,856

Berkeley Law & Technology Group, LLC  
5250 NE Elam Young Parkway, Suite 850  
Hillsboro, Oregon 97124  
503.640.6475